

R  
113191

JPRS-TAC-86-002

3 JANUARY 1986

19981112 059

Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 8

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

7  
53  
A04

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

3 January 1986

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA's Bovin: 'SDI 'Time Bomb' Threatens U.S.-Soviet Relations (A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 5 Dec 85) .....	1
PRAVDA Sees SDI as 'Chief Obstacle' to Arms Limitation (Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Dec 85) .....	4
TASS Analyst: 'Aggression' Is Real Aim of SDI (Moscow TASS, 16 Dec 85) .....	7
Moscow Weekly: SDI Goals 'Cancel Out' ABM Treaty (Gennadiy Gerasimov; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, No 45, 10 Nov 85)	9
USSR's Sagdeyev Interviewed on SDI, Consequences in FRG Paper (Roald Sagdeyev Interview; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 5 Dec 85) .....	14
FRG Postponement of SDI Decision Analyzed (Rolf Zundel; Hamburg DIE ZEIT, 11 Oct 85) .....	18

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG's Kohl Comments on Outcome of Geneva Summit (Various sources, various dates) .....	24
ZDF Interview, Helmut Kohl Interview	24
Assesses Summit, Helmut Kohl Interview	26

#### NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

U.S. Reply to Soviet Verification Proposal Decried (Various sources, 20 Dec 85) .....	27
Response Shows Real Stance	27
U.S. To Continue Buildup	28
Testing Termed 'Shortsighted', Aleksandr Zholkver	29

USSR 'Ready To Agree on On-the-Spot Verification Measures' (Moscow TASS, 19 Dec 85) .....	31
RELATED ISSUES	
PRAVDA: Military-Industrial Complex' Influence Harms U.S. (V. Gan; Moscow PRAVDA, 17 Dec 85) .....	33
Gorbachev Meets With Cochairman of Antiwar Group (Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Dec 85) .....	37
USSR on Bulgarian Defense Minister's Visit (Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Dec 85) .....	40
Shevardnadze, Mladenov Speeches	40
Joint Communique Issued	41
TASS: UNGA First Committee Adopts Resolutions on Arms Issues (Moscow TASS, various dates) .....	43
Concludes Discussion	43
Support for Soviet Proposal	43
USSR's Israelyan Remarks	44
TASS Notes UNGA Discussion, Resolutions on Disarmament (Various sources, various dates) .....	45
Broad Response to 'Star Peace'	45
USSR's Representative Assesses Issues	46
Discussion Ends	47
Briefs	
Indian Vice President Denounces Arms Race	49
TASS: Canadian Government Withholds Facts	49
UN Adopts Nuclear Cooperation Resolution	49

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA'S BOVIN: SDI 'TIME BOMB' THREATENS U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

PMO41620 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "The Main Obstacle"]

[Text] The recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was an important and significant event in international life. It demonstrated the possibility and benefit of political dialogue, and understanding of the unthinkability and disastrousness of a nuclear missile war, and a willingness to remove the frightening instability of Soviet-U.S. relations. Hope has emerged.

But, what people are describing as the "Geneva spirit" is too ephemeral to become the foundation of political forecasts. How many similar "spirits" have there already been which have evaporated in an atmosphere of mistrust and confrontation.... the task is therefore to ensure that the "Geneva spirit" is translated into Geneva deeds. There are no simple, easily accessible solutions to this task, especially if you consider that up to now Geneva has not produced agreement on the main issues -- not to transfer the arms race into space and to prevent the militarization of outer space.

M.S. Gorbachev spelled out our arguments and our logic to the U.S. President. The Soviet Union sees no sense in a reduction of arms on earth with a parallel appearance and buildup of arms in space. The militarization of space would expand the scale of military rivalry, intensify the degree of unpredictability and uncertainty in the development of events, and erode strategic stability. Under conditions of strategic chaos, the arms race would inevitably get out of control, which would mean an increased threat of war.

Unfortunately, the U.S. side repeated the same old arguments of the U.S. Administration, arguments that have been repeatedly refuted, even by the Americans themselves. It was said again that the United States has no aggressive intentions, does not pursue military superiority, and is ready to transfer the results of work under the "Strategic Defense Initiative" program to the Soviet Union.

But what was said in Geneva differs decisively from what has been said and done for years in Washington. Addressing Congress not so long ago, U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger told his audience: "If we succeed in acquiring a system which will be effective and make the Soviet Union's arms ineffective, then we will have regained our former position when we were the only country possessing nuclear weapons." It cannot be put any clearer. He feels overpowering nostalgia for that irretrievably lost time when the United States was "the only one...." This is why there is the need for the "star wars" program, to which Washington is clinging for dear life.

As for the transfer of SDI "secrets" to the Soviet Union, even in the United States no one takes this idea seriously. Here, for example, is what well-known journalist W. Safire wrote in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "When an idea enters President Reagan's head, an idea which seems to him to be exceptionally important for the achievement of his goals, he holds onto this idea. Even though this idea may be ridiculed by his opponents, undermined by his officials, and simply ignored by the press, the invariably ebullient Reagan brings it up time and time again... just like your pet dog may drop at your feet the same old stinking bone. Forget about the pleasant-smelling new rubber toy. The dog feels an inexplicable attraction for the scruffy old bone. One such idea," W. Safire concludes, "is the President's proposal to share space-based defense technology with the Russians." The comparison suggested by W. Safire can hardly be described as elegant. But let us leave to the U.S. journalists' conscience the expressions they use when writing about the U.S. President. We are interested in the essence. In this case, the ones who do not take the President's idea seriously are essentially right.

Engaged in a comprehensive defense of SDI, administration spokesmen at times launch counterattacks, so to speak. For example, K. Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, noted a "curious inconsistency" in Soviet materials in connection with SDI. What is this inconsistency? It appears that on the one hand the "initiative" is presented as "a dangerous and destabilizing factor which will be opposed by Soviet countermeasures," while on the other it is claimed SDI "will be ineffective and useless." This is followed by the snide question: "If the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' will be ineffective, why are the Russians so worried about it?"

The director is malicious in vain.

We are concerned because it is us and our countermeasures that will have to ensure guaranteed reductions in the effectiveness of the planned space defense. And, if necessary, we will do this. But, as was stated in Geneva, that is not our choice. Soviet people do not want to waste their intellectual and material resources on a new spiral of the arms race. That is the first point.

Second, we are concerned that the Americans, having come to believe in the effectiveness and "absolute reliability" of an ABM system, will decide one day to test it under real conditions. Indeed, not for nothing have hundreds of billions been spent... The Americans are making a mistake. But there will be no one to analyze it and no one to tell the former possessors of the "miracle of military technology" that the money has been spent for nothing.

And third, the very nature of a large-scale ABM system and the minimal time interval during which thousands of targets would have to be detected, strike means sent to intercept them, strike effectiveness assessed, and so on and so forth, virtually removes man from the decisionmaking process. This immeasurably increases the proportion of tragic errors and accidents of all kinds. The question of whether mankind is to be or not to be will be decided by computers, not people. Whatever our attitudes toward U.S. politicians and generals, we prefer to deal with them rather than their computers -- even if they are sixth generation...

The fourth round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms will start in January -- again in Geneva. There are two packages of proposals, Soviet and U.S., on the table. These proposals diverge in many respects and differ sharply. Nonetheless, there are points of contact between them. A real opportunity has emerged for starting to narrow the gap between positions and seeking a compromise and a mutually acceptable solution. But a strange and almost paradoxical situation has arisen. Weapons that are being created can be blocked by reducing weapons already in existence.

There is, I repeat, an opportunity for reaching agreement. The main obstacle is the position of the United States, which continues to insist on the need to put weapons into space. The absence of positive shifts on this decisive avenue shows that the time bomb placed under Soviet-U.S. relations by Washington strategists has still not been defused. The timer is continuing the countdown.

And yet, we can hope the Americans have not said their final word. After Geneva the struggle around SDI intensified. Pressure groups defending the "star wars" program -- first and foremost, the military-industrial complex -- do not want to give up their positions. But there are other people in various sectors of society who comprehend all the destructive power of the military-space fantasies. The clash of views and interests is continuing.

The Soviet Union will do everything possible to ensure the dangerous line is not crossed. We will strive to break the alarming course of events by dint of argument, example, and good sense.

We have no illusions. Not everything depends on us. But we will do what does depend on us. We will do it so that Moscow and Washington can be bound not by a balance of fear, but by a balance of interests.

/12929

CSO: 5200/1188

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### PRAVDA SEES SDI AS 'CHIEF OBSTACLE' TO ARMS LIMITATION

PM131851 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Closing the Door to Space for War"]

[Text] 13 Dec--In the United States and among America's Western partners, whom the White House is trying to involve in its "star wars" program, there is increasing opposition to Washington's plans to militarize space, plans which threaten to wreck the efforts to limit and reduce nuclear armaments. The profound worldwide concern about the threat to peace in space was reflected by the resolution on preventing the arms race in space adopted by the UN General Assembly on the proposal of a large group of countries. In this resolution, for which the representatives of 151 states voted, the international community urgently called on the USSR and the United States to hold intensive and constructive talks, aimed at reaching an agreement as soon as possible which would shut tight the door to space for armaments.

The Geneva summit offers an opportunity for this. A number of prominent politicians emphasize that in the present conditions there is tremendous positive significance in the USSR and U.S. leaders' guideline in principle approved in Geneva which enshrined the general concept that nuclear war must never be launched, that there can be no winner in it, and that the USSR and the United States do not strive for military superiority. It is also of exceptional significance, commentators stress, that the Geneva joint document confirmed at the highest level the basic goals and tasks of the Soviet-U.S. joint statement, adopted 8 January 1985, which were: to prevent the arms race in space and end it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear armaments, and to strengthen strategic stability.

In this connection the "star wars" program is being criticized increasingly sharply. In a report entitled "The Search for Effective Arms Limitation: Recommendations, History, and Analysis," the U.S. lawyers' association came to the conclusion that the White House's "Strategic Defense Initiative," which is "aimed at deploying an ABM system with space-based elements, may lead to a dangerous acceleration of the arms race," since it will cause a "retaliatory buildup" of strategic offensive armaments on the USSR's part. The report also stresses that SDI is incompatible with the 1972 ABM Treaty and, if implemented, will undermine that treaty. Ultimately, SDI will give impetus to a "totally uncontrollable arms race in the sphere both of offensive



and defensive systems." The document stresses that "at the moment considerable opportunities remain to elaborate measures gradually leading to major reductions in offensive nuclear armaments." The lawyers' association sees such opportunities in talks based on the ABM Treaty. Their point of departure should be the "strengthening of the treaty itself by eliminating the gaps existing in it." By these gaps the report's authors mean the existence in the treaty of provisions which the U.S. side is deliberately exploiting to partially circumvent this treaty. The lawyers' association supported the need to "retain the ban on tests outside the laboratory and thereby, on the deployment of so-called defensive systems which are being developed [razrabatyvayemyye] within the SDI framework." In the opinion of the report's authors the rejection thus confirmed of the deployment of "star wars" systems will give impetus to the limitation and substantial reduction of nuclear armaments.

Samuel Wells, a prominent scientist and staffer at the Woodrow Wilson international scientists' center in Washington, noted at hearings in the U.S. Congress that U.S. allies are gravely alarmed at many of the main aspects of SDI. They are asking whether the implementation of SDI will not block the entire strategic arms control process and whether it will not lead to the nullification of the ABM Treaty.

"For most NATO members the SDI program remains far too dubious for them to approve immediately," Britain's THE GUARDIAN stresses, analyzing the results of the recently completed session of the NATO foreign ministers' council in Brussels. Opposition parties in Japan oppose their country's participation in the "star wars" program.

In the United States, simultaneously with the widening protests against the "star wars" program, those forces which defend the administration's position on questions of the use of space for military forces have stepped up their activity. Representatives of right-wing circles and the military-industrial complex, which is directly involved in state orders for the manufacture and testing of the elements of space defense, are expressing their views increasingly frequently. Particular zeal is displayed in this matter by Defense Secretary C. Weinberger; General J. Abrahamson, director of the organization to implement the SDI; F. Ikle, under secretary of defense; R. Perle, assistant secretary of defense; G. Keyworth, science adviser to the President; and notorious retired generals like D. Graham.

Thus, in a statement at the hearings in Congress on 10 December J. Abrahamson again tried to make out that the plans for the militarization of space are aimed at eliminating nuclear arms, that their objective is to "free the whole world from the fear of nuclear war." Abrahamson also tried once again to make the "star wars" program "fit" the ABM Treaty, claiming that its implementation takes account of the observance of that document. R. Perle, for his part, also speaking on Capitol Hill the other day, declared frankly that the United States firmly intends to continue work to create [sozdaniye] space strike arms within the framework of the "star wars" program. If research in this sphere culminates in success, he stressed, the deployment of a "strategic defense system will be an immediate prospect."

Right-wing forces in Congress, represented by Senators J. Helms and P. Laxalt and members of the House of Representatives J. Kemp and D. Edwards, entirely reject proposals for any restrictions on the SDI program. They actively advocate the repudiation of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and come out against the observance of

the SALT II treaty. This stepping up of the activity of SDI's champions is largely oriented toward extracting additional appropriations for that program from the U.S. Congress.

But despite all these efforts by militarist circles, in general, the country's public, as can be seen from public opinion polls, is aware that SDI is the chief obstacle in the path of nuclear arms limitation. The dangerous nature of this program of the U.S. Administration's is becoming increasingly apparent to U.S. public opinion. One indication is the continuing campaign to collect signatures for petitions in favor of scientists' refusing to conduct research within the SDI framework. This campaign has been launched in such major scientific centers as Cornell, Chicago, and Illinois Universities, Ohio State University, and the California and Massachusetts Institutes of Technology. It is reported that the petition has been signed by 10 Nobel Prize winners, among them the well-known physicist H. Bethe.

Continuing to analyze the results of Geneva, the U.S. press notes, in particular, that through the fault of the U.S. Administration, which proved not to be ready for real progress on key issues, an accord was not reached on such fundamental problems as nuclear arms reduction and the nonmilitarization of space. In this connection it is noted that as before, the path to the elimination of the threat of nuclear war lies not through the militarization of space, but through the strengthening of universal security, and it is these questions which mainly determine the state and development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Americans opposed to the arms race stress that the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike systems would sharply destabilize the entire strategic situation.

The administration's assurances on the defensive nature of SDI have nothing in common with the real state of affairs. It is quite obvious that progress along the path of the implementation of U.S. military space programs, on which the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex insist, will not strengthen U.S. security, but will, on the contrary, undermine it. In this connection they cite the remark made by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Geneva to the effect that the USSR will not remain an impassive observer in conditions where steps are being taken which undermine the Soviet Union's security and the security of the socialist countries. A compromise on the matter of nuclear arms reduction is possible, the Soviet leader stressed. But only given a total ban on space strike arms. If the door to space is firmly closed, the resolution of these questions is possible.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS ANALYST: 'AGGRESSION' IS REAL AIM OF SDI

LD161854 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 16 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 16 TASS -- Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst, writes:

In the debate, which has started in the USA on these days on the "star wars" problems, even the most zealous advocates of the deployment of a large-scale outer space-based anti-ballistic missile defense system are forced to admit that an ABM system cannot ensure an invulnerability of the United States territory. Washington's official representatives do not deny the fact that even after many years of work on the programme of the "Strategic Defence Initiative," spendings on which will turn into 1,000 billion dollars, the U.S. ABM system will not be able to neutralize a retaliatory strike against the U.S. territory. The same officials agree with the critics of the SDI that if even less than ten per cent of the launched nuclear warheads break through the system, this will be enough to throw the United States back into the Stone Age.

What is then the real aim of the U.S. "star wars" plan: Washington's official representatives give at times different answers to this question.

"The aim of the SDI is not an attempt to ensure superiority, but to preserve the strategic equilibrium and thus the guarantees of stable deterrence," said General James Abrahamson, director of the U.S. organisation for the implementation of the SDI, addressing the recent open hearings at the U.S. Congress. John Gardner, assistant of the same Abrahamson, told a conference of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers in Washington, which was held behind closed doors, that the implementation of the SDI would sharply change the nuclear balance in favour of the USA and thus enable the United States to preserve a sufficient offensive potential even after "bilateral nuclear exchanges."

There is a good reason to believe that while General Abrahamson was talking on "deterrence" and "preserving a strategic equilibrium" by means of the SDI programme in order to mislead international public, his assistant John Gardner let out the real aims of the apologists of the "star wars."

The Pentagon is working now not only on anti-ballistic missile weapons, but is also developing offensive weapons of enhanced effectiveness at the U.S. Air Force base in Norton in California. As the newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR said, the Pentagon is creating, in particular, manoeuvrable warheads on its intercontinental ballistic missiles and on Pershing-2 missiles in Western Europe capable of overcoming a limited

ABM of the opposite side, permitted under the treaty of 1972 on a limitation of the ABM systems. This, as the newspaper points out with good reasons, is in direct conflict with the aims of the U.S. SDI proclaimed in public.

In planning the militarisation of outer space and speeding up work to create strike space systems, the Pentagon is out to open a new extremely dangerous channel of the race of anti-ballistic missiles weapons, while simultaneously enhancing the effectiveness of its inter-continental ballistic missiles and submarine based ballistic missiles.

The Pentagon's strategy is aimed by no means at "making the nuclear weapons obsolete and useless," as the Washington propagandists claim. The real aim of the SDI is not defence, but aggression. Mr Weinberger and his assistants are preparing a potential of a first nuclear strike against the socialist countries, that will include also strike space systems deployed over the territory of the socialist countries under the "star wars" plan.

They in the Pentagon hope that as a result of a nuclear attack a considerable part of the Soviet force of retaliatory strike will be destroyed.

Then according to the plans of the Pentagon strategists, use will be made of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" system, that is supposed to be able to protect the aggressor from retribution.

The "star wars" plans are as absurd as the hopes of Washington for the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament in face of a threat to its security. In the event American weapons are deployed in outer space the Soviet Union will find effective means to counter these weapons systems. The answer will be sufficiently swift and less expensive than the U.S. programme.

The summit meeting in Geneva has demonstrated for the whole world to see that there are points of contact between the stands of the USSR and the USA, that there are opportunities for a quest for mutually acceptable decisions on the limitation and reduction of weapons.

The peoples of the world have the right to expect that the statements on the commitment of the USA to the "star wars" programme are not Washington's final say. In the final analysis, this programme, which is highly illusory, is equally dangerous to all countries of the world, including the USA.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW WEEKLY: SDI GOALS 'CANCEL OUT' ABM TREATY

PM131445 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 45, 10 Nov 85 p 5

[Article by Gennadiy Gerasimov: "Pacta Sunt Servanda; the Purport of the ABM Treaty"]

[Text] The US plans to develop the country's antimissile defence are in dire need of legal defence. Because there exists a document, officially entitled Treaty Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems, signed in Moscow in May 1972 and is of unlimited duration.

Some experts call the Treaty "a delicate and only child" of the military detente. It introduced a stabilizing element to military planning and should have abated the preoccupation with refining attack strategic systems, because the sides agreed to voluntarily recognize their own mutual vulnerability, to become, as it were, each other's hostages.

The Treaty, therefore, is based on an important strategic, it can even be said philosophical, understanding of the futility of planning for a victory in a nuclear war, which differs radically from the axioms and presumptions of all the authors of books on military history and strategy--from Sun Tzu and Thucydides, through Clausewitz to Liddel Hart.

### Juridical Nihilism

The real goal of the US "star wars" plans is the development of space attack weapons--first-strike weapons. This goal is in outright contradiction with the Treaty in the preamble of which the sides expressed the most laudable intentions to reduce the danger of a nuclear war breaking out.

But let us tackle the goal--officially proclaimed by US President Ronald Reagan--to spread an impregnable antimissile shield over the USA. This goal contradicts the very name of the Treaty on the limitation of the ABM systems, because this goal envisages the complete implementation of such systems rather than their limitation.

Experts are of the same mind. One example is the conclusion arrived at by Abram Chayes, Professor of Law at Harvard University, Antonia Handler Chayes,

on the staff of the same university, and former under secretary of the Air Force, and of Eliot Spitzer, a lawyer from New York, who co-wrote an article on the legal aspects of the ABM problems for the DAEDALUS--the Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. They said in part:

"It is clear that the task President Reagan has set before the American scientific community--to devise systems that will 'intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reach our own soil'--is a task that, if accomplished, would flatly violate the solemn treaty obligations of the United States."

It is worth recollecting that in 1972 Mr Reagan and many members of his present administration protested the Treaty which was then ratified in the Senate with a majority of 88 votes to 2.

Caspar Weinberger, US Secretary of Defense, is now also in fact protesting the Treaty, speaking of the need to consider the possibility of real breaking away from the ABM Treaty.

This is not being done because of the large political price that would have to be paid for the rupture. The USA would have shown once again for the whole world to see its disdainful approach to international law and its most important principle--pacta sunt servanda (treaties must be honoured). The public would have seen once more those who oppose arms reductions. And a blow would have been dealt to the relations with the allies who favor preserving and honouring the Treaty.

#### The Maze of Casuistry

Such political considerations force Reagan's administration to seek out a legal defence for its "star wars" programme. The report to Congress on the SDI for 1985 carried a supplement entitled "Compliance of the Strategic Defense Initiative with the ABM Treaty". Its authors are diligently pettifoggery and hairsplitting, for example, over how to interpret the words "ABM system components" and trying to establish if it is possible to deal with "subcomponents" without violating the letter of the Treaty. It is also sophistry--from which grain does a pile begin? This can be compared to the building of an autoworks without an assembly shop. They say they are not making cars but screws and bolts. But when enough of the "subcomponents" are manufactured there will be no problem in putting up an assembly shop.

Another loophole is being sought for in "research" which is in practice not forbidden. The Arms Control Impacts Statements, published annually by the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the other US papers draw the line on "research" at the laboratory door. Whatever is done under its roof is "research". Whatever goes on at the testing grounds is "development". The latter can be checked by using national technical means of verification, i.e. by having a close look from above. Gerard C. Smith, who led the US delegation at the talks on the ABM Treaty, at the Senate hearings in connection with its ratification, declared that the ban in the Treaty starts with field testing mainly because this ban can be controlled by national technical means and laboratory research cannot.

The SDI is subdivided into 15 independent projects. Only two of them correspond to the "under-roof experiments" category in accord with the above-mentioned "Compliance of the Strategic Defense Initiative with the ABM Treaty".

The double-action military technology, i.e. of the kind that can be used for other purposes, and for the SDI, too, is a most attractive "grey zone" for the ABM fanatics. Strictly speaking, the entire SDI is a double-action device because it is planned as both a defensive and an offensive weapon. Since the way such technology gets put to use depends on intentions which are subjective and cannot be controlled by national technical means, or by any other method for that matter, we must travel from the premise of the worst possible application.

The antisatellite weapons offer an example of double-action technology. The banning of orbiting such weapons in space would be useful not only in itself but also from the point of view of abiding by the ABM Treaty.

Another example was the testing in June 1984 by the USA of the ICBM Minuteman-1 for destroying the warhead of another such missile in flight, which can be regarded as a violation of Article VI of the Treaty which forbids giving missiles of this type capabilities to counter other missiles.

#### Siege of Article V

Attempts are also made to try to find loopholes in the text of Article II of the Treaty which defines the ABM system components--interceptor missiles, the launchers for them and ABM radars. The Article speaks of an ABM system "currently consisting" of these three parts.

The reasoning is--since the new "exotic technologies" may lack interceptor missiles, ABM launchers and radars, that means that they can be developed without a violation of the Treaty.

The narrow interpretation of Article II of the Treaty, which limits the ABM systems as such and not only as systems of a certain structure described in the Article, contradicts the meaning of the Treaty. The final wording "currently consisting" was intended precisely to prevent such a narrow interpretation appearing. Raymond Garthoff, who was on the US delegation at the ABM Treaty talks, wrote in the INTERNATIONAL SECURITY magazine in 1977: "The word 'currently' was deliberately inserted into a previously adopted text of Article II...in order to have the very effect of closing a loophole in the ban on future ABM systems."

A reference is being added to Article II on the agreed Statement D, which says that in the event of new ABM systems, based on different physical principles and with components substituted for missiles, launchers and radars, they should be discussed in the Standing Consultative Commission set up by the Treaty.

The interpretation offered in April by the extremely right-wing Heritage Foundation claims that the agreed Statement D, allows for the development of X-ray laser and other exotic space-based weapons included in the complex of the president's "star wars" programme.

A careful read of the D Statement leaves no doubts whatever that it speaks only of the permitted land-based ABM systems. It says that "in order to ensure fulfilment of the obligation not to deploy ABM systems and their components, except as permitted in Article III of the Treaty, the Parties agree that in the event ABM systems based on other physical principles...are created in the future, specific limitations on such systems and their components would be subject to discussion in accordance with Article XIII (which sets up the Standing Consultative Commission--G.G.) and agreement in accordance with Article XIV of the Treaty (which deals with possible amendments--G.G.)".

Article III, mentioned in Statement D, permits the deployment of an ABM system within an area having a radius of 150 km. Statement D deals with this restricted area. Any augmented interpretation of it would lead, in fact, to the abolishment of the main, Article V of the Treaty with its clearly forbidding wording (see the opening paragraphs).

When the Treaty was signed and ratified in the US Senate the idea was precisely to ban completely the national ABM systems for good. The Treaty was not regarded as a temporary measure, or a breathing spell in the nuclear arms race. The then US Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, Gerard Smith, head of the US delegation, and William Rogers, the US Secretary of State, spoke on this theme at the Congress commissions. Rogers, particular, declared that, besides the ban according to Article V, "perhaps of even greater importance as a qualitative limitation is that the Parties have agreed that future exotic types of ABM systems, i.e. systems depending on such devices as lasers, may not be deployed, even in permitted areas". And, indeed, the D Statement does not permit anything but just stresses that innovations are to become "subject to discussion".

This interpretation is also recognized in the Arms Control Impact Statement for the 1984 fiscal year submitted by the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This paper lists the bans according to Article V and says: "In addition, although the Treaty allows the development and testing of fixed, land-based ABM systems and components based on other physical principles...the Treaty prohibits the deployment of such fixed, land-based systems and components unless the Parties consult and amend the Treaty."

Special mention should be made of the plan to develop an X-ray laser because the fulfilment of this plan would lead to the violation not only of the ABM Treaty but also of the 1963 Treaty on nuclear tests ban, in which Article I bans any nuclear blasts in space, and also the provisions in the international law which prohibit the deployment of such weapons in space.



## A New Interpretation

Such were till recently the casuistic manipulations of the US opponents of the ABM Treaty, regularly accompanied by unsubstantiated charges addressed at the USSR of "violations" or "intentions" to violate the very same Treaty which the US Administration doesn't know how to get rid of. Strobe Talbott, a US journalist, wrote in his book "Deadly Gambits," published in 1984, after an in-depth study of the problem, that ever since its creation the Reagan administration was searching for ways to get rid of the ABM Treaty.

These steady quests have led lately to the so-called new interpretation of the Treaty, which emerged, according to Paul Nitze, the president's special assistant, as a result of a new study of the Treaty's text, agreed-upon statements and accords on mutual understanding, and also of the history of talks and official statements made after 1972.

As a result, Robert McFarlane, the president's assistant for national security, astonished the world by declaring that the ABM Treaty "sanctioned and permitted" the deployment and testing of space-based ABM systems. This caused extreme commotion and alarm among US allies. Consequently, the White House adopted on October 11 a "dual-track decision"--to agree legally with the "new" interpretation, but to retain the "old" one in practice. The time limits which the administration will condescend to observe the "old" interpretation were not mentioned. It is free to change its mind any time it likes. But as the reader has perhaps seen for himself, the "old" interpretation also distorts and violates the spirit and the letter of the ABM Treaty.

As for McFarlane arguments, they boil down to the assertion that the Treaty, allegedly, sanctions the testing of the ABM systems based on different principles. Strictly speaking, this is not a "new" interpretation, but a borrowing from the Heritage Foundation report, even though the press calls Philipp Kansberg, a young lawyer from the Pentagon, the pioneer of the idea who has only studied the problem less than a week.

John Rhinelander, the legal advisor of the US delegation at the talks on the ABM Treaty, an expert, says that the SDI renders the Treaty senseless. When asked if the Treaty couldn't be somehow modified to include the SDI, Rhinelander said--"the answer is 'no'"--because the USA aimed at developing a territorial ABM system with space-based elements, both of which are forbidden by the Treaty.

The booklet "The President's Strategic Defense Initiative," published by the White House, which is intended to explain to a doubting world just how noble the US intentions are, declares that the USA does not and shall not violate their Treaty commitments. The president once added that the SDI was so devised to confirm in full to all treaty obligations held by the USA. However, the goals and the logic of the SDI's development actually cancel out the most important Treaty on the limitation of the ABM systems.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### USSR'S SAGDEYEV INTERVIEWED ON SDI, CONSEQUENCES IN FRG PAPER

DW081241 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 5 Dec 85 p 8

[Interview with Roald Sagdeyev, director of the Moscow Space Research Institute and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by correspondent Pierre Simonitsch; date and place not given]

[Text] When asked about technical possibilities to produce SDI, Sagdeyev answered: "According to my personal experience as a scientist and technician, it does not seem possible to me to create such a system. However, one must proceed on the hypothesis of the worst case. Some of our military and politicians maintain that although the scientists are skilled, they can still err. Even if a tiny probability existed that the United States could master the technological difficulties, we must react and at least not neglect the built-up offensive capacities. At any rate, the money invested by the United States in military space research will produce some side products that will stimulate the arms race.

One can react to SDI in various ways. One answer would be confrontation between offensive and defensive weapons systems, in the form of a numerical and quantitative strengthening of our offensive missiles. If this answer were used, several variants of the active and passive nature would be offered. The decisive argument is costs and effectiveness. Which will be cheaper, to increase the number of nuclear warheads, or the defensive ability of missiles against an SDI shield. We have made a number of estimates with regard to costs and effectiveness. If one compares progress achieved in offensive weapons with progress in defensive weapons, costs and effectiveness are clearly in favor of the offensive capacities.

There are some simple possibilities to render SDI ineffective, such as hardening the protective cover of the missiles. A layer of carbon fibers could be placed on the missiles (carbon is a chemical element existing in its clear form in nature as diamonds and as graphite). If 1 gram of carbon fibers is put on 1 square cm, the resistance of the cover against laser beams would increase 5-10 times. The missile would become 100 kg heavier. However, that would only be equivalent to the weight of one or two warheads. (Soviet intercontinental missiles carry up to 10 individually guidable warheads.) A defensive shield against missiles would need 5-10 times more energy to increase its firepower accordingly. It would entail an enormous increase of weight and volume of the platforms in space and a cost explosion of at least 50 times, aside from the technological problems.

As regards the defensive shield against missiles, the "absence effect" must be considered. At any given time only those orbit stations would be effective that are over the

territory of the antagonist. The others that just pass over faraway continents are useless. However, they must be kept in orbit around the earth for rotation purposes. The "absence effect" necessitates a great number of platforms in space with 10 times more firepower than would actually be necessary to intercept launched missiles of the antagonist. It is absolutely utopian to hang combat platforms at an altitude of 36,000 km in a geostationary way over the equator. Rays cannot be concentrated over such a distance, and diversion would take place. Therefore, we are only talking about platforms with a low elliptic cycle around the earth."

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU (FR): Would it not be easy to shoot such objects down that are regularly cycling the earth?

Sagdeyev: "You are absolutely right. Laser guns could be used on the ground that are easier to produce than those based in space. In addition, the energy sources would not be limited, and one could pick the right moment. Imagine the extreme mutual mistrust if both sides had weapons similar to SDI! I can imagine that the United States would be afraid or concerned if hundreds of combat platforms of Soviet origin with defensive weapons would fly over their territory. Reagan's invitation to build a missile defense system in space together with the United States does not make sense. Its acceptance would lead to a situation in which in every 90 minutes an armada of Soviet combat platforms would cross the United States -- with every platform weighing several hundred tons, that is considerably bigger than the current space stations.

Just the risk that such big objects could be hit by micrometeorites is great. What would happen in a climate of mistrust, if one party found that its 'hardware' was damaged while crossing the territory of the adversary. Even if the damage was caused by swarms of meteorites, it would be assumed that it was the work of the adversary."

FR: Is it correct that laser beams do not penetrate the atmosphere and that, therefore, they are unfit for fighting ground targets?

Sagdeyev: "In order to penetrate the atmosphere with high-energy rays, one must select a certain wavelength in the spectrum of visible light. X-rays, infrared, and ultra-violet rays are out. The second problem is the irregularity of the atmosphere created by the warming-up of air layers and the reflection of warmth from the surface of the earth. The density of the atmosphere is also variable. These phenomena explain why the stars seem to twinkle. A laser beam would be somewhat distorted by these irregularities, and the sharpness of its focus would become indistinct. In order to improve this, one needs progressive reflectors. This problem is very difficult, but in principle it can be solved."

FR: The SDI project envisages land-based laser guns, the rays of which are reflected onto the target by mirrors in space. Can the mirrors resist the rays?

Sagdeyev: "That is a great technological problem. If a mirror reflected 100 percent of the incoming light, it would be simple. However, it is unavoidable that a very small percentage of the light is being absorbed by the mirror, heating it up. It is technically difficult to achieve resistance against warmth. The mention of various difficulties will make those firms that will get the contracts happy. They will make more money."

FR: U.S. Government representatives maintain that the Soviet Union has been engaged for a long time in space weapons research, and that it has invested more money in it than the United States...

Sagdayev: "That is very typical. If the said Americans must try hard to get moral and financial support for their plans, they play various instruments, producing absolutely dissonant music. A simple logical analysis shows that their arguments are contradictory. High-ranking U.S. officials such as George Keyworth, the President's scientific adviser, say: 'We are far ahead of the Russians in SDI technology.' On the other hand, however, some think that the Soviet Union is leading and that the United States must hurry up to get going. As a joke, the different statements could be applied to the following rational formula: 'The Soviet Union is the realm of evil, it is superior to us in SDI technology, but we would be happy to share our technology with it.'

"Advocates of SDI simply deceive the people. They outline the technological beauty of SDI for them. U.S. television programs and video games in restaurants show, with simple tricks, how easy it is to shoot Russian missiles down. This world of simulated laser beams on screens experiences a boom. The ideas and the imaginary power of the people are attracted by this beauty, and no discussion takes place about the effects of SDI on strategic stability and possible countermeasures."

FR: Does the Soviet Union feel equal to the United States in weapons technology?

Sagdayev: "According to my personal opinion, science and technology in both states is practically zero with regard to defense in space, if one considers what is needed for an SDI system. This is also true regarding partial defense with space platforms. However, I am concerned that the United States could initiate a broad program that would hinder realistic disarmament steps."

FR: Is the Soviet Union really afraid of an SDI program the implementation of which would be decided on in 25 years at the earliest?

Sagdayev: "Fear is not the right word; extreme concern would be better. We are not afraid of the sudden appearance of U.S. SDI platforms in space, but we are most concerned that the logical conclusion with regard to the senselessness of the arms race will not be realized. We consider the SDI concept as the reaction of some groups within the U.S. Administration to the demand of many people for real disarmament. These groups believe they have found a nice way to shift the thinking of the United States from arms control to a standby position until the absolute shield is achieved, making nuclear weapons worthless."

The current strategic balance through deterrence is unpleasant, but at least stable. Nobody will begin nuclear war in cold blood, I hope. What would happen if we shifted from mutual deterrence to defense systems such as SDI? There would be two SDI systems in space, circling the world practically on the same orbit, mixing to become 'blue' and 'red' flying objects. The question is: Would two armadas living together be stable? Both would have an enormous firepower to destroy intercontinental missiles. One tenth of this firepower would suffice to shoot the neighboring armada down. These platforms would be flying on exactly known orbits, and someone could calmly prepare an attack, press a button and destroy the whole space fleet of the antagonist in a single blow."

FR: Could missiles torpedo an SDI defense system if they were launched on such a flat trajectory that they would not leave the atmosphere?

Sagdayev: "In principle yes. It would have to be a hybrid between a cruise missile and an intercontinental missile. Many things are possible, but they must be seen in

connection with their costs and effectiveness. Naturally, it would be much simpler to construct such hybrid missiles for the intermediate-range systems that do not have to fly to another part of the world. Therefore, I do not understand the enthusiasm of some West Europeans regarding participation in SDI."

FR: Mr Sagdeyev, the United States has accused the Soviet Union of building a huge radar installation near Krasnoyarsk for antimissile defense, thus violating the ABM Treaty. According to the Soviet, however, it is a civilian station for the observation of objects flying in space. Why does the Soviet Union not permit the United States to have a look at it?

Sagdeyev: "We are prepared to go as far as necessary when inspectors are invited. However, before one agrees on verification, one must agree on basic intentions. Everything indicates that the U.S. accusations are not aimed at negotiating with us, but at heating up a discussion to get more money from Congress for armaments."

FR: Is there a significant difference between a military and a civilian radar installation?

Sagdeyev: "The only difference is that for civil stations, not as much money is usually available as it is for military ones. For the civil observation of objects in orbit, rotating bowls follow just one object and project it on one point of the radar screen. Thus, the whole scenery is not projected on the picture. In the meantime, there is such dense traffic in space that this technology does not suffice any more. A 'phased array radar', like that under construction in Krasnoyarsk, replaces mechanical operations by electrical ones. The signals are received and distributed by a number of electronic diapoles.

A phased array radar is more expensive because it is more complicated. However, considerably more information is received that way. The civilian space segment has been strongly extended, and there are now many customers such as the ministry for telecommunications, the hydrometeorological service, or remote sensing of the surface of the earth. For all these customers it is much cheaper to use one central phased array radar instead of many separate reflectors. The Krasnoyarsk installation is under construction. Several years will pass until it will be completed."

In the further course of the talk, Sagdeyev contests that the Soviet Union is leading in the field of antisatellite weapons (ASAT). The tests made between 1968 and 1982, which according to the United States led to the setup of the only ASAT system ready for action, served, according to Sagdeyev, only the purpose of catching up technologically with the United States. The United States experimented in the early seventies with missiles designed to shoot down satellites. Then the program was discontinued because of insufficient accuracy in hitting the target. Whether the Soviet Union has developed "killer satellites" or only antisatellite missiles, is considered by Sagdeyev as hairsplitting. Regardless of how the weapon is named, it must always be in orbit to get close to the satellite of the adversary. At any rate, the Soviet system is only suited for shooting down low-flying satellites. According to the opinion of the director of the Moscow Space Research Institute, the United States is again ahead with their antisatellite missiles launched from aircraft. "That is a new development," he says. "The United States does not want an ASAT ban because they believe that this a field where they have a qualitative lead," he adds.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1200

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### FRG POSTPONEMENT OF SDI DECISION ANALYZED

Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 11 Oct 85 p 5

[Article by Rolf Zundel: "Much Ado and No Decision. The SDI Decision Has Been Put Off Till the End of the Year"]

[Text] Late last week the coalition in Bonn seemed to be moving toward a basic agreement with Washington on German participation in SDI. In the meantime, it has changed its course again. The government continues to have difficulty dealing with the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Bonn, October--Whenever truly fundamental controversies take place in Bonn, the moment always comes where government spokesmen in exaggerated innocence and reporters in quiet resignation ask the question: did something happen? For one or two days it appeared as if the decision had been made in Bonn concerning the involvement of the FRG in the American SDI--contrary to the presumed desires of the foreign minister and for reasons which contradict the judgment of the research minister. By week's end, however, after many damage control and good-will missions--the chancellor had spoken with the foreign minister, his department chief with FDP caucus chairman Mischnick, who had previously publicly rebuked the "civil servant" ["official"]--everything was back where it started.

Following the meeting of the Federal Security Council (a cabinet committee of those ministers who are concerned with security questions) came the announcement that the matter would continue to be studied. The decision is to be made, if at all, at the end of the year. Perhaps, thus one learns without prompting from many experts, the Reagan/Gorbachev meeting in Geneva will cause the whole thing to appear in a different light. And what, after all, is meant by a "decision re SDI," thus the second communication, when the only matters being debated are the conditions under which a number of firms are to take part in the basic research of the Americans for their space defense program. There have been no negotiations on development and production, to say nothing of strategy. It is at most a question of giving the firms legal-technological assistance; there was no trace here of high-level politics.

At least one thing is shared by the protagonists in this controversy, the department chief in the chancellor's office, Teltschick, who on the occasion of a recent address on the subject of SDI was introduced with the remark that his

official title did not do full justice to his political significance, and the foreign minister: both wish to dedramatize. Genscher is telling everyone not to pour oil on the fire; Teltschick considers himself misunderstood as an SDI fan. Did nothing happen?

#### Somersaults of the Imagination

From the beginning, ever since Reagan announced his program, the controversy has been hard to follow: is it a major shift in strategy, which with the aid of new defensive weapons will, following its realization, offer a true defense against missile attacks and will finally put an end to the deterrence doctrine, or is it only another round in the arms race? The only thing that seemed certain at the beginning was that this program, provided with \$26 billion for the first 5 years, signified a tremendous technological thrust for the United States. Aside from this, much could be read into it, and this did in fact happen.

The bait for the FRG was probably the hope of being able to latch on to a project which in its dimensions is comparable to the Manhattan and the Apollo projects, so as not to fall behind in modern technology. Proponents of FRG involvement point this out already at the outset of their argumentation; many, including the chancellor, have clung to this view to this day. And the imagination turned somersaults, ran wild; there was talk of billions that would go to West German industry, and there were dreams of financial participation and of taking over whole subsystems of the research. Several members of parliament, fascinated by military strategy, already saw themselves at a laser cannon in a spaceship, sighting in on the onion towers of the Kremlin. And in North Rhine-Westphalia, Bernhard Worms [CDU chief in that state] well-meaningly but without success brought to life the expectation among the populace that SDI would mean new jobs.

A second factor insured that SDI became a major topic of domestic politics. Washington does indeed attach some importance to European and German support. The statement heard later, that participation was not a touchstone of loyalty to the alliance, was by no means so clearly voiced at the beginning, and even today basic criticism and quibbling over details are not especially welcome. But whenever German-American relations are affected, the reactions in the FRG quickly grow beyond all bounds. Part of the CDU/CSU caucus in the Bundestag was of the opinion anyway that the faster and more of SDI, the better. The great majority, who gave less thought to the program, felt that a clear signal of loyalty to the alliance was necessary in any event. In addition, the program provided the CDU/CSU caucus with the opportunity to pillory the SPD, which had rather quickly agreed on rejection in principle of SDI. For many a CDU/CSU strategist, SDI became welcome proof of the anti-Americanism of the Social Democrats. And Minister for Youth, Family and Health Geissler even went so far as to make a vote in favor of SDI a question of political morality.

In this phase the chancellor's office almost appeared to be the homestead of doubters. In the spring, when German and American experts were meeting in Dallas, the Social Democrats were still praising the circumspect and restrained argumentation of Teltschick, who at that time did not by any means speak of approval, but of studying and evaluating and of the need for additional information. Defense Minister Woerner, on the other hand, after an initial phase of

skepticism, had by that time long since avowed his support publicly. Already at that time it became evident that SDI was destined to become a matter to be dealt with by the chancellor. The CDU/CSU would probably not have permitted Kohl to put the controversial issue on ice in one of the ministries, least of all in the foreign ministry.

Here a third element in the decision-making process becomes evident: the growing displeasure of the CDU/CSU with the foreign minister. One can safely assume that Strauss, who bet on SDI from the outset, and whose critical remarks stemmed only from concern that the transport of the technology could be hindered, will use every opportunity to find fault with the foreign minister. But in the CDU as well the feeling is widespread that Genscher is making a name for himself, at the expense of the CDU/CSU, as an authority on foreign policy reason: never entirely comprehensible but yet discernible—and, as the CDU/CSU suspects, thanks also to skillful background talks—at an annoying distance.

Where Genscher says No, as in the maritime law convention, for instance, the Yes of the CDU/CSU is significantly advanced. Where he pleads for restraint, as with SDI, even those Christian Democrats who basically feel the same way are put in a difficult position. One's career aspirations are not helped by being caught agreeing with Genscher in a matter of controversy.

The situation is further complicated by two factors: For one thing, by the fact that Horst Teltschick, department chief in the chancellor's office, has more than any of his predecessors attained political stature of a special kind. The dangerous dualism which for a long time marked American politics—the rivalry between the security advisor and the secretary of state—is now also no longer completely unknown in Bonn. Teltschick is power-conscious, and he has been sent forward on several occasions by the chancellor as his foreign policy spokesman, especially with respect to SDI. This is a situation which does not exactly facilitate the smooth decision-making process.

For another thing, the CDU/CSU, and sometimes the chancellor's office as well, has deliberately circulated the notion that Genscher's tenure as foreign minister is not permanent. One hears accounts that the chancellor treats FDP [national party] chairman and Minister for Economics Bangemann with particular amiability in the cabinet, there are no problems as far as he is concerned. And one can learn without asking in CDU circles that, actually, the economics minister felt destined for other things—as foreign minister, for example. However, the problem will take care of itself if the FDP returns to the Bundestag in the same strength as today, or perhaps even stronger. The FDP will not drop Genscher. And as far as SDI is concerned, the party is, if anything, more obstructionist than the foreign minister.

#### Power Struggles in the Coalition

All these things, the emotional domestic reaction to SDI as well as the subtle power struggles within the coalition, were responsible for making an objectively difficult decision even more difficult—a situation which is strongly reminiscent of the days before Bitburg.



Basically, a very simple course of action could have been taken: To deal with the SDI project as noiselessly as possible, to leave it with the foreign ministry, to wait and see what the project actually offered, to avoid fanfare: business as usual, as in the other European countries as well. For the time being, all that is at stake, as has meanwhile become evident, is that the Americans are interested in awarding individual contracts to German firms in the basic research area. No one can prevent this, otherwise the government would have had to pass an "anti-SDI-law" which would have been difficult to reconcile with our interpretation of the constitution, and not even the SPD is demanding this.

Opposing this were the dynamics of the SDI discussion in the FRG. We have tried, thus the chancellor's office--and the line of reasoning is not false--to keep the discussion objective, to guide it into sensible channels. These efforts, however, were accompanied by an increasing commitment to the project. This is the one trend, which has been discernible since spring. The other trend, probably found more in the foreign ministry, attempts to relativize the motives for SDI and to narrow down the foreign and security policy conditions for its acceptance. It is clear that these two political courses can be reconciled only with difficulty, if at all.

The commitment to SDI, in principle already contained in the first reaction of the CDU/CSU, increased the moment an interministerial working group chaired by Teltschick was formed. An institution such as this, to put it into political German, generates a "need for decisions." The expectation that results and unequivocal decisions would soon be forthcoming increased. Added to this was an intense information and promotion exchange between the United States and the FRG, which finally culminated in the dispatch of a high-level and much publicized delegation to the United States. This delegation was additionally tasked by the chancellor to study the possibilities for a basic agreement. How else could this delegation have been expected to return but highly impressed by the willingness of the Americans to release information, with positive feelings about the possibilities for German participation, and satisfied by the fact that the Americans considered a basic agreement, which was desired by the industrial representatives of the delegation, to be possible.

Teltschick's public report of this trip as well as the positive assessment of its results--a rather unusual occurrence--marked the end, for the time being, of this policy of commitment. It was supplemented by a political assessment by Teltschick, nicely wrapped in the empty rhetorical phrase that the FRG must make up its mind whether it wants to be the subject, or the object, of developments. The chancellor will have difficulty backing away from this formulation, assuming he even wants to.

The second course of development, the relativization of SDI, began initially with the primary argument of its proponents, namely that SDI represented a major opportunity to enter the technology of the future. Genscher does not deny that, for the Americans, SDI means a tremendous technological effort utilizing enormous government resources. His doubts, however, begin where the scope and the value of the technology transfer for the FRG are under discussion. The scope of possible German involvement can be expressed in terms of

thousandths of the overall program, and the proportionate relationship of this participation to the overall state-sponsored promotion of research in the FRG is similar.

The technology transfer, which is tied to American laws anyway (for the contracts will be paid for by Americans), is on a modest scale. Here the foreign ministry is of the same opinion as the research ministry. Minister Riesenhuber stated this for the record even more clearly than Genscher: "SDI cannot be justified on the basis of the civilian research-political benefits to be derived therefrom." For the foreign ministry, the far more promising method of accomplishing the technological leap is the "Eureka" project, which offers the additional advantage of bringing the Europeans together.

#### Open to All Interpretations

The second relativization--in the form of a limiting condition--was the argument that the FRG must stay in the European commune and that above all the sensitivities of the French must be considered. "No singularity" is the formula, which means: The FRG cannot participate in the SDI program in the form of a state-level agreement as the only, and as the first, country to do so. A condition that is difficult to fill if it is strictly interpreted.

The third relativization consists of the conditions which the Federal Security Council established in March already for a German SDI involvement, and which Federal Chancellor Kohl explained in the Bundestag--among them: no arms race, no variable security zones, no strategic instability. The conditions are so formulated that a national German participation is actually impossible. It is highly improbable that these conditions can be met, at least no one can safely predict that they will be.

In the chancellor's address to the Bundestag on 19 April, the two courses of action--commitment [to SDI] and a skepticism armed with conditions--met in an astonishing way. Kohl agreed with the limiting conditions and nevertheless asserted that the FRG supported "in principle the American program for strategic defense." Small wonder, therefore, that Bonn's position admits of all possible interpretations.

The logic of Genscher's argumentation suggests concluding--he himself has never said this, however--that the foreign minister views very skeptically the commitment of the FRG to SDI in the form of an agreement with the United States. At any rate, he stands opposed to the trends expressed in a draft of the agreement, whose authors probably sit in the defense ministry, the preamble of which sounds as if the Americans and the Germans together had to invent NATO all over again.

Not only European irritation, above all in France, could result from a surging forward by the West Germans. And this irritation has been clearly evidenced already, at least during the time of the economic summit meeting in Bonn. Even in the CDU one takes note of unpleasant warnings from the East: an agreement will be taken as a political signal and answered accordingly. There is even talk of Honecker's visit being jeopardized. The assessment of these signals

within the CDU/CSU varies, but one can safely assume that careful note is taken of them in the foreign ministry.

And now? Basically, the whole problem has been condensed down to the question whether the FRG concludes a politically inconspicuous agreement of a technical nature with the United States or renegotiates the security agreement, which the foreign ministry as well does not rule out--or if, as would probably make the most sense, nothing at all happens.

Again the question thrusts itself upon the mind: Did something happen?

12689/12859

CSO: 3620/42

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### FRG'S KOHL COMMENTS ON OUTCOME OF GENEVA SUMMIT

#### ZDF Interview

DW221039 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 2045 GMT 21 Nov 85

[Interview with Chancellor Helmut Kohl by correspondent Bodo H. Hauser in Brussels on 21 November; from the "Heute-Journal" program -- recorded]

[Text] [Hauser] Mr Chancellor, have the specific interests of Europe, including the Federal Republic, been properly taken into account during this summit?

[Kohl] I believe so, Mr Hauser. We were most intensively involved in the preparations. We exchanged views with the Soviet leadership, and with the United States, there was regular contact up to the last days before the summit. What is referred to as consultation outstandingly proved its worth. This became very evident here in Brussels today as well, because all government chiefs or foreign ministers of NATO who were here expressly emphasized this point. The U.S. President finds himself in the highly unusual situation -- as hardly any one of his predecessors had ever been -- where he was able to truly experience the unity of the alliance in Geneva. This is extremely important for the future as well. And Geneva produced what was possible at this time to begin with, an essential improvement in the climate.

Well, people might say that this is not much. Yet recalling the ice age visions of the past few years, you will find that this is quite a lot indeed. And as a German, Mr Hauser, I may be allowed to recall that 2 years ago nearly to the week we had large-scale demonstrations in Bonn and elsewhere against the deployment of the U.S. Pershing missiles. The opponents of deployment at the time warned us that a new ice age would set in, that a missile fence would be lowered between East and West, and that we could no longer get together.

Today we can state in no uncertain terms: Without the clear decision of my government -- a decision which I took over from my predecessor who, however, was unable to enforce it -- all this would not have been conceivable because the alliance would have been plunged into a stage of erosion. But I have always said that creating peace with fewer weapons not only means bearing the defense of peace and freedom in mind but also being capable of making moves toward the other. This is exactly what the West, NATO, the U.S. President have done.

Secondly, I believe that the fact that the next round of dialogue has already been scheduled for next year in the United States and that President Reagan has accepted the invitation to visit the Soviet Union the year after next, signals what will also

precipitate in the details involved in the continuation of the negotiations in Geneva, in Vienna, in Stockholm, or elsewhere. After 6 years this has been the first, real frank talking contact.

[Hauser] You just hinted that the statement mentions the continued dialogue, meaning a new phase in the East-West relations. What about the participation of the Europeans and/or the Federal Republic?

[Kohl] There are direct contacts at the Vienna negotiations and in others. We have two options: our own participation in this or that instance, and indirect participation through support of the U.S. negotiating position or through the introduction of our concepts into this position. What has been possible in Geneva, after all, had essentially been influenced in the past few months and years by the Federal Government I am heading.

I had been laughed at, Mr Hauser, especially at home, when I told General Secretary Andropov 3 years ago that we need such a meeting and that the era of not talking between the world powers needs to be overcome. But, today that it is a generally accepted view.

The communique contains something else that is important. It not only refers to weapons and disarmament -- important though they are -- but also to the improvement in the relations on a broad front. I do not think that we will really make headway in East-West contacts if we exclusively deal with disarmament and detente in the weapons sector -- important as that may be -- while the other issues such as sports contacts, cultural contacts, the meeting of people on the whole, and a scientific exchange will fall to the wayside. All this belongs together, for an improvement in the climate needs to be comprehensive.

[Hauser] What does Geneva mean to Bonn's decision on SDI?

[Kohl] On that subject we established a clear position beforehand. We said that we would wait to see what Geneva will produce on that particular point. The antagonistic positions remained unchanged in Geneva, that is quite obvious. It is just as evident that the positions have become a bit more relative. I have always considered the U.S. SDI program morally justified and reasonable. I have always said that we will not contribute any tax funds to that end, but German companies have been invited to participate, and they will. In the next few weeks, before Christmas, we will have a final discussion in the coalition and in the government on how this must, can, and should be settled on the part of the state. This will take place in considerable harmony. It will turn out the quarrel some people would have liked to fan over this matter will not materialize.

[Hauser] To quote you: The big water draws along the small water. What does this mean for inner-German relations?

[Kohl] Inner-German relations can -- in view of the partition we have and must suffer between East and West, Eastern and Western Europe, East Germany and West Germany, clear across our fatherland -- thrive only if the overall climate develops favorably. This possibility would be nonexistent now had the ice age predicted at the time really set in. It was possible in the past 2 years to improve relations with the GDR, notwithstanding the realization that this is not a democratic country and that mutual differences exist.

I invited Mr Honecker for a working visit. He has accepted this invitation; now it is up to him to state when he would like to come. Then we will come to terms on what

is necessary, and then we will have to talk about all the things that trouble people in Germany. My goal is, above all, to alleviate the situation of the people in the divided country, to allow people to get together, to make it easier to make visits, to seek and work out solutions together in many fields in which practical solutions can be found; just think of environment protection, the improvement in traffic relations, and many other fields.

I cannot do away with the partitioning. This is a historical mandate, but I adhere to the unity of the nation as provided for by the preamble of our Basic Law. This does indeed involve a thorny stretch of road that we must travel, yet as far as I am concerned it means that I must do everything in my power to get people together. On my part there will not be any recognition of any GDR citizenship, because this would spell aggravation of partitioning, and I will have no part in that.

#### Assesses Summit

DW221221 Hamburg BILD in German 22 Nov 85 p 4

[Interview with Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl by W. Kenntemich and R. Voelkel; date and place not given]

[Text] BILD: How do you assess the result of the Geneva summit?

Kohl: It is for me personally a reason for special satisfaction. It has proved that for many years I have correctly assessed President Reagan's personality and policy and that I was right in advocating a summit meeting. The result meets my government's expectations to a large degree and also is in accordance with the intensive German-U.S. preparations by myself and Foreign Minister Genscher.

BILD: What do you consider as being particularly gratifying?

Kohl: I welcome in particular the fact that both statesmen have agreed to resume a regular political dialogue on all levels and plan to hold another summit meeting soon. If the dialogue is consistently continued we may well get close to the goal that in the current East-West situation war must never again become likely. Every war, be it nuclear or conventional, must under any circumstances be avoided. It is especially in our interests that both sides seek to reach interim agreements on intermediate-range missiles by which we are particularly threatened.

/9274

CSO: 5200/2561

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### U.S. REPLY TO SOVIET VERIFICATION PROPOSAL DECRIED

#### Response Shows Real Stance

LD202006 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 20 Dec 85

["Nuclear Blasts Moratorium Defers War Menace " -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

Kenneth Adelman, director of the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in an interview with an AP correspondent concerning the PRAVDA article of December 19 on a nuclear blast ban, said he welcomed the Soviet emphasis on verification problems. He immediately avoided, however, the question on the U.S. joining the moratorium unilaterally introduced by the Soviet Union in August 1985.

Other White House officials also welcomed the USSR's new proposals, but expressed the opinion that the U.S. Administration will hardly join the Soviet moratorium.

Experts note unanimously that the problem of terminating nuclear explosions is a kind of litmus-paper which shows a precise stance of any government on the entire complex of problems of limiting and reducing armaments. Nuclear tests are an accelerator, catalyst of the arms race. Their termination would put an end to the development of new and perfection of old systems of mass annihilation. Even the most zealous advocates of the concept of sudden nuclear strike or "limited" nuclear war would hardly find it easy to use first untested weapons of unprecedented yield.

So far, the present American Administration has categorically rejected even the discussion of the issue of ending nuclear weapon tests, referring to difficulties of verification. It put forward the invented argument of the unreliability of the existing national technical means of verifying compliance with such an accord.

In a bid to break the deadlock on the issue of nuclear weapon testing, the Soviet Union proposed to the United States to take advantage of several countries' agreement and set up special stations on their territories to monitor the accord on ending tests. In order to remove possible doubts with regard to the observance of the agreement, the USSR suggested an agreement with the United States on certain measures of on-spot verification, given the introduction of a reciprocal moratorium on nuclear blasts.

Commenting on the latest Soviet initiatives, even the most conservative press bodies in the West note their constructive peaceful character. "The Soviet offer removes the

biggest obstacle in the way of a comprehensive test ban treaty", stressed THE TIMES of London.

Quite recently, Washington officials claimed that the United States would agree to banning nuclear tests once that the verification problem was settled. At present, when the problem is no longer an obstacle, even according to the strictest criteria, the Pentagon advances another condition for the U.S. joining the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, that of completing the modernization of American nuclear systems.

The condition is strange, to say the least. The essence of ending nuclear tests is precisely that of preventing the modernization" of systems of mass annihilation, curbing the race of armaments and deferring the threat of their use. Besides, no one in the United States can say when the "modernization" will be completed. As is known, the current military programmes of the United States are intended for decades, and they are being expanded, not curtailed.

The new Soviet initiatives on ending the nuclear explosions give Washington yet another chance to improve its image of unreliable partner in negotiations on reducing the risk of nuclear war, and prove by deeds, not by words, its desire to "make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete".

One would like to hope that the United States, in handling the problem, will be guided by vital interests of all of mankind, rather than by timeserving illusory consideration of gaining military superiority.

#### U.S. To Continue Buildup

LD202254 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 20 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The U.S. Administration has again rejected the idea of imposing a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests and refused to follow the Soviet Union's example which unilaterally stopped all nuclear explosions last August. At a meeting with journalists last Thursday, White House spokesman for the press Spokes said that the United States does not agree to a moratorium and holds that moratoria on nuclear tests cannot be counted on to lead to the enhanced security. According to him, U.S. nuclear weapons testing "is required to ensure the reliability and safety of the U.S. arsenal."

Thus, it is apparent that the U.S. Administration has no alternatives to the striving to continue the policy of the buildup of nuclear potential, including space strike systems. All peaceable statements, the promises to make nuclear weapons "obsolete and useless" are empty words aimed at misleading the public and at continuing under the cover of the verbiage the course at achieving military superiority over the USSR.

In general opinion, the Soviet-U.S. Geneva summit has become a turning point in the efforts to curb the nuclear arms race, including space arms, and it is quite understandable that people all over the world expect from the United States concrete steps to lower the level of confrontation, to lessen tension. A lot has been said by the USA. Deeds are what is needed now. Instead of that the U.S. Administration turns to the past for arguments only to falsify and distort the Soviet foreign policy in an effort to justify its own unwillingness to agree to mutual limitation of nuclear arms and



prevent the militarization of space. After the Geneva meeting the Soviet Union has already made new initiatives to develop its stand, the initiatives aimed at the limitation of strategic nuclear potentials and protection of outer space from the arms race, including matters of control, also the idea of using an international system of verification.

What else do our opponents need? The Soviet Union has stopped unilaterally all nuclear explosions. It agrees to working out effective verification. It expressed the readiness to resume the talks on general and complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, that is in all the media -- in the atmosphere, in outer space, under water and underground.

They in Washington, however, want the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament, but this is something they will not get. The Soviet Union can be dealt with only on the principle of equality and equal security of the sides. This is understood by many even on the Capitol Hill: As the UP reported, 44 U.S. senators from the Republican and Democratic parties turned on Thursday to President Reagan with a proposal to start talks with the Soviet Union on ending all nuclear explosions. In their letter to the President they note that by announcing last August the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, the Soviet side thus showed its striving to conclude an all-embracing treaty on the matter.

It is clear to every unbiased person that a joint Soviet-American moratorium on all nuclear explosions would become a major landmark on the road to the removal of nuclear danger.

#### Testing Termed 'Shortsighted'

LD202002 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] A representative of the White House has made a statement on the problem of ending the testing of atomic weapons. Here is a news commentary: At the microphone is Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer:

The current statement shows that the Washington administration can no longer ignore one of the most important problems of the present day. This is not surprising, for the more time that passes, the wider circles of the world public grow and the more insistently they demand a complete ending to nuclear testing. At the same time, the most varied authoritative forums, from the UN General Assembly to international scientists' meetings, are pointing out that halting nuclear explosions would be the greatest contribution to curbing the arms' race. For such explosions are not only a dangerous game with fire and a source of mistrust in relations between states, but a type of motivating force, pushing on the production of ever newer and more destructive types of arms -- not only on earth, but in space.

Our country has issued an important initiative designed to put an end to such a dangerous development. Since 6 August this year, the day of the 40th anniversary of the U.S. bombing of Hiroshima, the USSR has unilaterally ended all types of atomic explosions. This moratorium of ours will last until January 1986. But it can be extended if the United States takes the same step.

Now, a representative of the White House, while promising to end nuclear explosions at some time, is rejecting the idea of an immediate moratorium. It is striking that

before Washington was justifying its negative position by some kind of difficulty in control and now, when it has been convincingly confirmed that any nuclear explosions can be accurately determined by modern technological means, the White House representative announces right out that it is not actually a matter of control, you see.

Yes, all of this is merely a pretext. The real thing is that the U.S. military-industrial complex, for which arms production is the most profitable business, is obstinately unwilling to give up plans for the further increase of arms and hopes for achieving military superiority. This is the aim of the record U.S. military budget for next year, which has just been pushed through Congress.

But this is a dangerous and shortsighted policy. The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva showed strikingly that, in our nuclear age, international problems can only be solved by way of talks.

The United Nations has declared next year to be International Year of Peace. The United States joining the Soviet initiative on ending nuclear explosions would be a most important contribution to the cause of peace.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1202

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR 'READY TO AGREE ON ON-THE-SPOT VERIFICATION MEASURES'

LD191510 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 19 TASS--By TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov.

The Pentagon has rejected the demands by many congressmen, scientists and experts who insisted on cancelling nuclear testing, slated for today, with a view to developing strike space weapons under the Strategic Defense Initiative programme.

Thus, today's underground nuclear explosion, codenamed Goldstone, at the Nevada test site, shows that Washington is boosting the implementation of its "star wars" project.

The explosion convincingly confirms that the United States is using the continued nuclear testing for developing new, ever more perfect and ominous types of nuclear armaments, the race of which it is now seeking to move into outer space.

This is taking place at a time when there is a unique chance for stopping all nuclear tests, which is the innermost desire of all peace-loving people. The chance emerged as a result of the initiative of the Soviet Union which unilaterally suspended all nuclear blasts from August 6 and urged the United States to do likewise. The Soviet moratorium, as announced, will remain in effect till January 1, but it can be extended further on if the United States joins in.

The world community demands that the moratorium be made mutual and be extended beyond January 1. The desire was expressed, specifically, in an appeal by the leaders of six states -- Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania and Sweden, by a group of world-known Nobel-winning scientists, the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and others. The U.N. General Assembly came out the other day in favour of the immediate termination and prohibition of nuclear tests. Only three countries, the United States, Britain and France, voted against the resolution to this effect.

The termination of nuclear blasts is the issue on which concrete, rather tangible results can be achieved already now. The USSR, by its constructive approach to the issue, has removed all obstacles which are being artificially put up by the West, opening broad opportunities for a mutually acceptable solution. It suggested concrete ways to ensure a full solution to the verification problem as well. In addition to the use of rather perfect national technical means, owned by the USSR and the United States, the Soviet Union backs the idea of an international verification system. It is ready to

go still further and agree with the United States on some measures of on-the-spot verification which would fully eliminate possible doubts as to the observance of the moratorium.

What is necessary under these conditions is a political will and determination to display a constructive attitude to the moratorium as an imperative of the time. It now depends on Washington whether the powerful engine pushing the arms race will be stopped, or whether its flywheel will start turning even quicker.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1202

## RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA: MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX' INFLUENCE HARMS U.S.

PM161957 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Gan: "Justifying Hopes"]

[Text] Washington, December -- The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva has introduced positive elements to U.S. political life. It may be said without exaggeration that it has lent powerful impetus to hopes of the possibility of a constructive solution to the fundamental problems of our time. You frequently hear people here talking of the "spirit of Geneva-85," by which they mean the emergence of preconditions for long-needed advances in the area of curbing the arms race and normalizing the political and psychological climate in bilateral and international relations.

For perfectly understandable reasons, the understanding, enshrined in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement, that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no victors in it generated a special response here. It is no secret that the irresponsible utterances of some U.S. politicians about the "permissibility" of a nuclear conflict and the adventurist concepts of "limited" nuclear strikes have generated a natural reaction in people, making them seriously fear for the destiny of mankind. The words heard from Geneva about the two countries' intention to prevent a catastrophe and not seek military superiority heartened many people and filled them with optimism.

In brief, the majority of Americans welcomed the meeting, considering it the first important step on the path of stabilizing relations and halting the suicidal "race to oblivion." That is why urgent calls are being heard in the United States now to refrain from actions undermining what was achieved in Geneva and to promote the creation of opportunities for practical steps to prevent the arms race in space and halt it on earth.

At the same time, of course, it would be a blatant exaggeration to speak here of the existence of unanimity in assessments of the results of Geneva. A motley, far from homogenous picture is formed from the sum total of opinions, viewpoints, and arguments.

The people who welcomed the Geneva meeting's results with approval are opposed by forces which, unable to thwart the meeting, are now trying to wreak revenge by fuelling anti-Sovietism and militarist hysteria. "We are told that summit meetings are useless, that nothing has changed, and that the arms race will continue until an actual nuclear Armageddon," WASHINGTON POST observer (L. Kenn) writes, commenting on the campaign launched by reactionary ideological centers for the revision of the Geneva results.

On the basis of articles in the press here it is not particularly difficult to determine the methods which are most current in this campaign right now. Alongside the frankly slanderous distortion of the USSR's views and positions on fundamental problems of the present day, phony claims are being disseminated alleging that the difficulties in reaching agreements arise in no way through Washington's fault, but because of "the Soviet Union's inflexibility" and its "failure to understand" the U.S. Administration's policy. Thus, for instance, a report from Moscow published in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR states that the Soviet side seems to be "misinformed" as to the nature of U.S. policy and the functioning of the U.S. political system. "Hence its view of the United States differs strongly from what is actually the case," the same newspaper asserted in another article from the Soviet capital.

The background to the ill-intentioned and simply inflammatory articles appearing in newspapers and magazines here every day is clear. They very obviously reflect the intention of certain circles to continue to stoke tension in Soviet-U.S. relations and to justify the course toward militarism. These goals are camouflaged by expatiations about Washington's "sincere desire" for detente and arms control, which is allegedly coming up against "Soviet expansionism and aggressiveness" and "hostility and distrust" with regard to the United States.

Take just the "Strategic Defense Initiative," better known as the "star wars" program. Why, THE WASHINGTON POST asks in hypocritical surprise, does the Soviet Union not believe in the U.S. leadership's desire to create a strictly defensive "shield" which would help to stabilize the situation and ultimately rid us of nuclear weapons? The only answer, the newspaper tries to persuade us, is that the Soviet side has "either incomplete or erroneous information." And although the facts state that the anti-missile space system is being conceived by no means as a "shield", but as part of a single offensive complex, the newspaper categorically denies that the United States has any plans to create space strike armaments.

A pretense? Undoubtedly. But there is also misinformation here aimed at the gullible. Here is what is notable: The calumny against the Soviet Union is very often actually contained in articles from Moscow correspondents of leading U.S. newspapers. Indeed, the correspondents themselves sometimes directly cite embassy officials who supply them with this "information" and with tendentious "analyses," "conclusions," and anonymous "competent statements."

However, it may be, arguments involving the Soviet Union's "failure to understand" the political process in the United States do not stand up to criticism collapsing at the very first objective comparison with existing realities. For instance, take the "resentment" over the fact that the Soviet side is allegedly exaggerating the influence of the military-industrial complex in Washington's corridors of power. How can you assart this if you consider that U.S. political scientists themselves invented the term "Pentagonization of politics," having in mind the unprecedented interference in government activity by the Pentagon and the military-industrial complex corporations standing behind it?

In one article the well-known observer A. Lewis wrote of the U.S. diplomats and commentators who have termed the facts that the military contractors are pushing through the SDI program with a view to increasing their profits "inaccurate information" about the United States. How difficult it is, these diplomats and commentators say, to do business with this oversimplified view of America.

Here it is obviously worth remembering D. Eisenhower, the conservative Republican who could scarcely know how prophetic were to be his warnings about the danger of "the military-industrial complex' acquisition of unjustified influence." In the past 25 years the merging of state power with military-industrial capital has reached an unprecedented level. For instance, while in 1980 military appropriations in the United States totalled \$138 billion, in the fall of 1985 Congress approved the earmarking of \$302.5 billion to the Defense Department.

THE WASHINGTON POST once calculated that by 1990 the total Pentagon expenditure in the postwar period will have amounted to a sum sufficient to buy everything in the United States except the land -- all the houses, plants, trains, aircraft, refrigerators... A minimum of 6 million Americans are now working for the military-industrial complex, which in the past few decades has put 30-50 percent of all U.S. scientists in its service.

"Nowadays," the authoritative scientist (J. Vizner), former adviser on science to presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, says, "it is no longer a question of controlling the military-industrial complex. It is now a question of preventing the United States from being transformed into a totally military society."

There are various ways in which the military-industrial complex influences Washington's policy. Thus, the military-industrial complex corporations have become the main suppliers of personnel for key posts in successive administrations. In the past 10 years Boeing alone has "temporarily posted" nearly 400 of its employees to work in government offices.

You don't need to go far for examples. The present U.S. defense secretary to government service from the Bechtel Corporation, which constructs military bases. Aldridge, under secretary of the Air Force, worked in the Douglas Aircraft and LTV Aerospace and Planning corporations. General J. Vessey, recently retired as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now has a seat on the board of directors of the Martin Marietta corporation, one of the Pentagon's leading contractors. In other words, the time-honed "revolving doors" principle, whereby there is a constant rotation of military business managers between their firms' headquarters and administration posts, is in operation in relations between Washington and the military-industrial complex.

When the present Republican administration proclaimed its gigantic program for "rearming America" on the pretext of closing the mythical "window of vulnerability," it was the military-industrial complex once again that was behind it. In the past 5 years this program has cost the country over \$1 trillion, driving the United States' accumulation of nuclear and other armaments to insane speeds.

The militarization of the U.S. economy and the growth of the military-industrial complex' dangerous influence on Washington's policy could not fail to lead to the point where the "law of the fist" was advanced to the fore in U.S. international actions. The United States' piratical invasion of Grenada, its aggression in Lebanon, the undeclared war against revolutionary Nicaragua, and the expansion of its armed intervention in Angola and other parts of the world are graphic confirmation of that.

The deployment of new first-strike nuclear missile weapons in the West European countries and the creation of MX ICBM's for the same purpose, the building of the B-1B strategic bombers and Trident missile-carrying submarines and finally, the work which is being accelerated to implement the "star wars" program clearly reflect the administration's publicly declared credo in its approach to the Soviet Union -- "No -- from a position of strength."

The U.S. course toward the implementation of the "star wars" program has resounded to loud applause in the headquarters of the military-industrial complex corporations, which realize full well that it promises them new profits. After all, the Pentagon right now has already invested over \$2 billion in so-called "research work" under the SDI program, concluding over 1,500 contracts.

These are all obstinate facts which Americans themselves admit. What "exaggeration" of the military-industrial complex' role can there be when its influence on U.S. political and economic life has become so all-pervasive and so dangerous?

Something else is also obvious, however. However powerful the military-industrial complex' agents in the shape of the Pentagon may be, the decisive word nonetheless remains with the chief of U.S. legislative power. The importance of the Geneva meeting will, of course, be revealed in practical deeds. We are prepared to implement everything useful achieved in Geneva and have the right to expect that the same approach will be displayed by the U.S. leadership.

Few people in our day doubt that militarism is hostile to the peoples, that the arms race lashed on by the military-industrial complex' thirst for profit is senseless and harms the vitally important interests of all countries and all peoples, including the U.S. people.

/6091  
CSO: 5200/1198



## RELATED ISSUES

### GORBACHEV MEETS WITH COCHAIRMAN OF ANTIWAR GROUP

PM181815 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Dec 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With B. Lown, U.S. Cochairman of the International Movement 'International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War'"]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 18 December received in the Kremlin, Professor Bernard Lown, the U.S. cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement. Also taking part in the meeting was the Soviet cochairman of the movement, Academician Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov.

In the course of the conversation, Bernard Lown spoke about the activity of the movement which has in its ranks more than 145,000 doctors and medical workers from more than 50 states. Studying the possible medical and biological consequences of nuclear war and providing information on the data to the public, politicians, and governments, the movement makes a substantial contribution to the cause of eliminating the threat of nuclear war. Its program provides for freezing, curtailing and eliminating nuclear weapons; a ban on tests; a refusal to make first use of such weapons; the non-proliferation of the arms race to space; and broad international peaceful cooperation.

Bernard Lown emphasized the exceptional importance of drawing broad masses of the peoples into the discussion on ending the arms race and eliminating the threat of nuclear war. The voice of the peoples should be heard and should exert an influence on governments' decisions. Bernard Lown gave a high assessment of the USSR's peace initiative, particularly the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was announced 6 August this year. The call to announce such a moratorium was contained in an appeal from the fifth international congress of the doctors' movement, addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan in the summer of this year. Halting nuclear tests, Lown said, corresponds to the aspirations of all peoples.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev congratulated Prof Bernard Lown and Academician Yevgeniy Ivanovich Chazov on the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize for 1985 to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement. The Soviet Union, he said, is very sympathetic and respectful toward the activity of this movement, and its socially significant healing mission. Today it rightly holds an authoritative place in the world antiwar movement. Doctors reveal the bleak truth that people should know in order to prevent that which is irreparable. In this sense the Hippocratic Oath which binds doctors to protect their patients from everything that could threaten their lives has really taken on a new dimension in the nuclear age.

The appeal of the fifth congress of the international doctors' movement, addressed to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States of America, is permeated with a passionate desire to make all the world's inhabitants safe from the dire consequences of a nuclear disaster. Human thought is not always capable of grasping in time changes which take place on an historic scale. This is a serious shortcoming and a particularly dangerous one now, when the threat of total nuclear annihilation has come to every house and every family. Therefore, the voice of the peoples is becoming more and more significant, as is the voice of their public organizations in defense of peace.

This is an expression of a kind of instinct of self-preservation of mankind. A peace [mir] built on deterrence with the aid of nuclear weapons is a shaky peace. To strengthen it by building up armaments, whether earth- or space-based, is not possible. No one has yet invented a more reliable and efficient model of relations between states than detente and cooperation in conditions of peace and mutual security. A reduction in the level of military confrontation between states would strengthen the framework of these relations by imparting on them stability and reliability.

It was on precisely this basis, Comrade Gorbachev stressed, that we agreed to the Geneva meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States of America. In the course of this meeting, an important beginning was made on normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations and prerequisites were laid down for making the international situation as a whole more healthy.

But we are seeing something else too. Reactionary, aggressively minded circles in the United States of America, who at one time applied quite some effort to wreck the Geneva meeting, are now going into the attack against its consequences. An extensive campaign has been unleashed against the normalization of relations with the USSR and the strengthening of mutual trust in Soviet-U.S. relations which the two sides agreed on in Geneva. Press propaganda, television, and movies are being actively used to whip up mistrust and hostility toward the USSR and the Soviet people.

Evidently there are people in the United States of America who are very much concerned by the fact that the participants in the Geneva talks came out in favor of greater mutual understanding between our peoples. The notorious hawks, to all appearances, have given themselves the aim of preventing the implementation of the Geneva accords, of destroying, or at least rendering worthless the new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Unfortunately, the latest public utterances of state leaders in the United States of America do not seem to be in concert with the "spirit of Geneva."

As for the Soviet Union, its policy is clear and consistent. The Soviet Union agrees to travel its part of the path toward construction of a structure of firm mutual security and peaceful cooperation with the United States, but we expect the same thing from the U.S. leadership.

In Geneva we stretched out our hand to the United States. We are ready to change from competition in arms to disarmament, from confrontation to cooperation. "Cooperation and not confrontation." This was the slogan of the recent international congress of the doctors' movement. One cannot but agree with it.

At present, cooperation is an essential condition both for the progress of our civilization and for our common survival. The Soviet Union will go as far as is

necessary toward the total liquidation of nuclear weapons and final elimination of the threat of a war in which they are used. We advocate securing in deed man's prime right, the right to life. We advocate an immediate freeze on nuclear weapons and a total ban on their testing with no time limit and with the most effective control. Our sole condition is reciprocity.

As a major and real step toward universal nuclear disarmament we proposed to the United States that a radical cut of 50 percent be made in strategic nuclear arsenals at the same time, of course, as a total ban on space strike weapons. That is, the repudiation of the "star wars" program which is only capable of wiping out all efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons and of whipping up the arms race to an unprecedented scale. As a result, as the doctors' movement address rightly notes, the threat of a global nuclear conflict would be sharply increased. Practically the entire world now understands this. One hundred fifty-one states, essentially all the members of the United Nations, except for the United States of America, have just voted in favor of the UN General Assembly resolution on preventing the arms race in space.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev dwelt especially on the question of halting tests of nuclear weapons, for which the organization of doctors insistently calls, backing up their appeal with convincing justification.

The moratorium on all nuclear explosions, announced by the Soviet Union on 6 August this year, was highly appraised in the world.

In taking this step we proceeded from a sincere wish to break the vicious circle, to halt the endless perfection of nuclear weapons, to lead to an effective dying out [omertvleniye] of their stockpiles. I spoke about this to President Reagan in Geneva, Comrade Gorbachev said. To my profound regret, the United States has so far not followed our example.

Replying to Bernard Lown, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: We are ready to extend the validity of the moratorium introduced by the USSR on nuclear explosions if the United States reciprocates. We insistently appeal to the U.S. Administration to do this. There is still a unique chance to make the moratorium reciprocal and to extend it further after 1 January. To miss this chance -- paving the way to a final treaty-based ban on all tests of nuclear weapons -- would be unwise, to say the least. The solution to the problem is in the hands of the U.S. Government. Professor Lown is right: The peoples expect an immediate halt and ban on tests of nuclear weapons. Evidence of this is the UN General Assembly resolution adopted the other day practically unanimously, with only three votes against -- the United States, Britain, and France.

In conclusion, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev wished those taking part in the conversation and all members of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement fresh successes in their extremely necessary and noble activity.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1198

## RELATED ISSUES

### USSR ON BULGARIAN DEFENSE MINISTER'S VISIT

#### Shevardnadze, Mladenov Speeches

PM141945 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In an Atmosphere of Friendship"]

[Excerpts] E.A. Shevardnadze organized a luncheon in P. Mladenov's honor. At the luncheon were P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture; A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and other officials; on the Bulgarian side were the officials accompanying P. Mladenov.

Addressing the guest, E.A. Shevardnadze said: As regards the results of the talks that have just ended, we feel great satisfaction. There has been a really productive and comradely exchange of views, as there should be with real friends and brothers, on important questions of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation and topical international problems.

These conversations have reaffirmed a complete unity of views and a mutual determination to further deepen and improve the radiant relations between the communist parties and states and their cooperation in foreign policy.

In international affairs too the Soviet Union and Bulgaria act harmoniously and operate as comrades in arms and like-minded countries. The commonality of our positions is manifested in the definition of the main task for actions in the international arena, which consists in reversing the arms race, and primarily the nuclear arms race, tightly sealing off the path to space for any weapons, and on that basis achieving a radical improvement in the international atmosphere.

Our course and our commitment to seeking solutions to the most complex problems by political means and by means of talks, was expressed in the statement by the Warsaw Pact members adopted recently at the Sofia conference of the Political Consultative Committee. This approach was the basis of the USSR delegation's activity at the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, whose results are being perceived hopefully by peoples throughout the world.

Bulgaria's peace-loving policy and its active efforts, with other countries, to advance the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans has earned profound respect in the international arena.

We are cooperating closely wherever the front of the struggle may lie to avert nuclear war and to ensure the peoples' security: in the United Nations, at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, at the Vienna talks, and at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. Coordinating our actions in the international arena and complete mutual understanding are a question of major politics.

In reply, P. Mladenov observed: The year to which we are bidding farewell has not brought the peoples tranquility. What is more, tension in the world has reached a dangerous point. It has become increasingly clear that we cannot wait, that we must take energetic actions and decisive measures. And the USSR, true to its peace-loving foreign policy, resolved to assume the initiative. With a sense of realism and guided by goodwill, it adopted [vosprinyal] a new approach to the resolution of the key problems of today. Its efforts were aimed at the main thing -- averting an arms race in space and preventing it on earth. Following a whole range of proposals and unilateral steps in this direction, the most important step was taken -- the initiative to hold a summit meeting between the USSR and the United States.

The meeting between Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan, P. Mladenov continued, is of exceptional importance. The resumption of dialogue between the USSR and the United States creates favorable preconditions for positive changes, for an improvement in the international atmosphere, and for a return to detente. It is important for these opportunities to be turned into concrete deeds. It is now up to the U.S. side.

The Soviet Union's stance at Geneva is wholly in line with the coordinated foreign policy line of the fraternal socialist countries and meets the national interests of each of them. In the complex and tense international situation, the significance of the cohesion and unity of the fraternal countries in the international arena is growing. A key factor for strengthening the positions and authority of the socialist community and implementing its coordinated foreign policy is the deepening of our political, economic, and military cooperation on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

Shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, Bulgaria will continue to work for the good of peace and mutual understanding between states. Its vigorous activity, aimed at firmly establishing relations of good-neighborliness, trust, and fruitful cooperation between the Balkan countries and implementing the idea of transforming the Balkans into a nuclear-weapon-free zone, is devoted to this noble aim.

#### Joint Communiqué Issued

PM141556 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Excerpt] The USSR and the Bulgarian People's Republic expressed firm determination to strengthen to the utmost the unity and cohesion of the socialist community states and to enhance the effectiveness of their cooperation within the Warsaw Pact and CEMA frameworks in the interests of the strengthening of peace, international security, and social progress. They noted the paramount significance of the foreign policy program adopted at the Sofia conference of the Political Consultative Committee and of the meeting of top leaders from Warsaw Pact states for the advancement of the joint peace-loving positions of

socialist community countries in the interests of solving key questions of our time. It was from this point of view that the ministers reviewed the key problems of international relations. The Bulgarian side expressed total support for the Soviet state's peace-loving foreign policy aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear war, terminating the arms race, and preventing its spread to outer space.

During a discussion of the results of the Geneva meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan, the ministers emphasized that the meeting was an important event in international life and that its results will create more favorable opportunities for the improvement of the international situation. The USSR and the Bulgarian People's Republic consider that follow-up steps are necessary to ensure that political declarations are translated into specific decisions. They noted in particular the importance of the statement by the USSR and U.S. leaders regarding the impermissibility of nuclear war and also of the sides' pledges not to strive to attain military superiority. The ministers are unanimous that, as the Prague meeting of the top leaders of Warsaw Pact states emphasized, in today's international situation it is necessary to act in a coordinated manner and aim for a turn for the better in European and world affairs.

In this connection the sides declared their resolve to increase the efforts aimed at the termination of the arms race and at real advancement toward disarmament. Great significance in this respect was attached to an accord on the termination of all nuclear explosions and to the solution of the task concerning the total prohibition and liquidation of chemical weapons. The reaching of understanding at the Vienna talks on mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe on the basis of the well-known proposals by the socialist countries would accord with the same objective.

The ministers advocated the deepening of political dialogue between European countries in the interests of improving the situation in the continent. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the elaboration of substantial complementary measures on confidence- and security-building in Europe, both of political and military nature, at the Stockholm conference. Perceiving the creation of nuclear-free zones as an important means for reducing the danger of an outbreak of nuclear war, and also for strengthening security and stability on the European continent, both sides declared their total support for initiatives for the creation of such zones, including in the Balkans.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1198

## RELATED ISSUES

### TASS: UNGA FIRST COMMITTEE ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS ON ARMS ISSUES

#### Concludes Discussion

LD240044 Moscow TASS in English 2356 GMT 22 Nov 85

[Text] New York November 23 TASS--The first committee of the U.N. General Assembly has concluded the discussion and the adoption of resolutions on a whole package of disarmament problems. On the initiative of the socialist countries with the Soviet Union at the head which were actively supported by a wide range of non-aligned countries, the committee has adopted over 60 draft resolutions, primarily on the key problems connected with the removal of the threat of a nuclear war, the concrete ways of the discontinuation of the arms race on earth and its prevention in space. The Soviet concept of "star peace" whose most important ideas were reflected in the resolution "Prevention of the Arms Race in Outer Space" adopted by the committee was widely supported by the world community.

Concrete measures aimed at lessening the war threat include the signing of documents on the immediate termination and banning of nuclear weapons tests, on the nuclear arms freeze, on the need for the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, on the banning of the development and production of new types of mass destruction weapons.

It is noteworthy that the U.S. and its closest allies did not make any constructive contribution to the work of the first committee. Moreover, they tried in every way to block the efforts of the world community.

#### Support for Soviet Proposal

LD232254 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT 23 Nov 85

[Text] New York November 22 TASS--The concrete program, put forward by the USSR, for the development of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space meets with growing support at the United Nations Organisation. The Soviet proposal on non-militarisation of outer space and on the establishment of a world space organisation within the framework of which the countries of the world, instead of developing space weapons, would set about solving tasks of large-scale peaceful exploration of outer space, meets the vital aspirations of the whole of mankind. This has been stated

by Boldin Navchaa, representative of Mongolia, who spoke in the U.N. General Assembly's Special Political Committee which continues to discuss the item on international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

Representatives of Vietnam, Syria, Kenya, Ecuador and other countries condemned the space militarisation plans as running counter to the interests and aspirations of the peoples. To remove the threat of the use of outer space for military purposes is the call of the times which requires that weapons should never be orbited, stated Brazilian Representative Enrique Valle.

#### USSR's Israelyan Remarks

LD261948 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 26 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 26 TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reporting:

The discussion of the entire complex of disarmament issues in the First Committee of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly has demonstrated that the international community considers the prevention of an arms race in outer space to be its top-priority task, Viktor Israelyan, a member of the Collegium of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., said at a news conference at the United Nations headquarters.

This is evidenced by the fact that the First Committee passed the resolution on preventing an arms race in outer space. The document reflects the basic provisions of the Soviet proposal on international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarization. 131 countries voted in favor of adopting that resolution, and only the United States refused to support it.

The results of the work carried out by the First Committee which passed 66 resolutions, the Soviet representative said, reflect the growing concern of the international community with concrete and effective measures devised to eliminate the threat of nuclear holocaust and curb the arms race. At the same time the results of the committee's work mean a sure defeat of those quarters of the military-industrial complex which are escalating the arms race and pushing the world toward confrontation.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1198



## RELATED ISSUES

### TASS NOTES UNGA DISCUSSION, RESOLUTIONS ON DISARMAMENT

#### Broad Response to 'Star Peace'

LD132032 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 13 Dec 85

[Text] New York, December 13 TASS--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

By the overwhelming majority of votes the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly Thursday approved resolutions on key directions of disarmament. The document was sponsored by socialist countries led by the U.S.S.R. and a lot of nonaligned states which supported them.

A broad response was evoked by the concept of "star peace" advanced by the Soviet Union as a counter-balance to sinister "star wars" plans. A resolution on the prevention of an arms race in outer space embodying most important ideas set forth in the Soviet proposal for international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space in the conditions of its non-militarization was supported by 151 states. Not a single resolution on disarmament issues has received a bigger number of votes. Only the United States abstained from voting on that proposal which calls for blocking weapons into space. The isolation of the U.S. was only underscored by the fact that the only delegation which supported its position was that of the puppet regime of Grenada.

Only three Western nuclear powers -- the United States, Britain and France -- voted against the resolution calling for the immediate termination of prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. The resolution was initiated by the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist countries. That document stresses the imperative need of concluding a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapon tests by all states with a view to stopping and reversing the race in nuclear arms and ultimately achieving their complete elimination. The international community welcomed the moratorium on any nuclear explosions introduced by the Soviet Union's unilaterally [as received] and urged all countries to follow the example.

Most of the other 35 resolutions on disarmament issues endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly chart real ways for improving the international climate. These are primarily the resolutions on a nuclear arms freeze, on the prohibition of the development and production of new types of mass annihilation weapons and new systems of such weapons, on no first use of nuclear weapons, on the prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons, and on curbing the race in naval armaments. The fact that the General Assembly approved all these resolutions graphically reflects the growing

awareness of nations that it is necessary that urgent and responsible decisions should be made and concrete measures should be adopted to break the vicious circles of the arms race for the benefit of safeguarding the civilisation and the very life on earth.

Yannis Souliotis, the speaker of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, which discussed disarmament issues, it is the tasks of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space that are not the matter of prime concern for all humankind [sentence as received]. It would like to see the positive results of the most important international events of recent time -- the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva -- to be realized exactly along these lines.

However, the delegates to the United Nations General Assembly noted with regret that in the concrete approach to disarmament issues actions of the United States and a group of its closest NATO partners are still directed at obstructing the efforts of the United Nations in this field. Not to mention the U.S. indicative refusal to join the international community on the issue of preventing an arms race in space, the United States voted against 17 times, and twice in complete isolation, when other drafts were put to vote.

#### USSR's Representative Assesses Issues

LD172324 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The UN General Assembly has completed discussing the entire complex of questions of disarmament and strengthening international security. Our correspondent asked Comrade Troyanovskiy, the USSR's permanent representative at the United Nations, to comment on the results of the discussion:

[Begin Troyanovskiy recording] First of all, it was the jubilee 40th session. So naturally part of the time was devoted to various ceremonial matters. The second thing I should like to single out is the fact that the session's attention was to a considerable extent concentrated on the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan, on the preparation for the meeting, and especially, of course, the results. I think that it can be said that in the United Nations there exists a broad understanding and high assessment of the results. But at the same time there also exists an understanding of the fact that there still remain great efforts ahead, including on the part of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving forces in the world in order to ensure that the favorable prerequisites which have appeared are transformed into tangible results, especially in the area of preventing the threat of nuclear war.

It must be said that the United Nations, of course, is a sort of reflection of the real world in which we live, and in which there function various forces, both positive and negative. Therefore, attempts are being made, to divert, so to speak, the United Nations from the positive course which it was given way back by the creators of the charter 40 years ago. Nevertheless, I think that I will not at all be sinning against the truth if I say that the results of this session were fully favorable for the Soviet Union. First of all, note must be taken of the important resolution which was adopted and which envisages measures against a continuation of the arms race on earth, and against a continuation of the arms race on earth, and against transferring it into

space. This resolution was adopted and supported by virtually all countries of the world, and it should be noted that only one state -- the United States -- did not support that resolution, which fully reflects, so to speak, and responds to Soviet attitudes in this sphere. [end recording]

#### Discussion Ends

LD171052 Moscow TASS in English 0857 GMT 17 Dec 85

[Text] New York, December 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The U.N. General Assembly has wound up the discussion of the entire range of matters of disarmament and of the strengthening of international security, passing an aggregate of over 70 resolutions on them. In an overwhelming majority they reflected the striving to get out, through the efforts of all countries -- big and small, of the spell of dangerous tension, to take resolute and concrete measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race, to restore detente and substantially to improve the international climate. The USSR's large-scale peace initiatives on the cardinal matters of peace and security have been ardently approved by the international community.

It is symbolic that the 40th session of the U.S. General Assembly, completing this stage of work, has solemnly reaffirmed the important role of the declaration, which was adopted exactly 15 years ago on the initiative of the USSR, on strengthening international security and peace and on developing cooperation between states on the basis of the goals and principles of the U.N. Charter.

An adopted resolution to this effect points out that the goals proclaimed in the declaration are particularly topical owing to the growth of tension, the escalation of the race of arms, particularly nuclear ones, and the danger of the arms race's spreading over to outer space, which creates a serious threat to universal peace and security.

A whole number of documents point out the exceptional ruinousness of the arms race to universal peace and security and to social and economic progress of the peoples, and the indissoluble connection between disarmament and development goals. The session passed resolutions which emphasize the need to end the quantitative build-up and qualitative sophistication of nuclear arsenals and to freeze them. The U.N. General Assembly has confirmed the exceptional importance of the assumption by all states of an obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The actions of the initiators of the nuclear arms race have been severely criticized. Any hope for a victory in a nuclear war is senseless, for such a war will inevitably lead to the destruction of states, to tremendous devastations and disastrous consequences for civilization and for the very life on earth, points out one of the resolutions which has been adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes on the initiative of socialist countries. In this connection the United Nations organization has expressed conviction that there is a need to reject any military doctrines and concepts which could lead to an outbreak of nuclear war and hamper the taking of measures aimed at ending the nuclear arms race.

Having emphasized the importance of collective measures and of efforts on a multi-lateral basis for the solution of major matters of disarmament and for the strengthening of universal security, the international community also pointed out the immense importance which it attaches to Soviet-U.S. relations. A resolution, which has been adopted

in this connection on a suggestion by a large group of non-aligned and neutral states, stresses that the international community welcomes the Geneva talks between the USSR and the USA on the packages of matters concerning space and nuclear arms and is hoping that they all will be considered and settled in their interrelationship. It is noteworthy that only ten Western countries headed by the United States came out against the document.

In all, during the discussion of the set of disarmament and international security matters, the United States voted in the negative 33 times, including six times totally alone, thereby showing that when there is a necessity to move on from verbal assurances of "peaceable" intentions to practical deeds, the USA comes out against all the international community's efforts aimed at averting the war threat.

/6091

CSO: 5200/1198

## RELATED ISSUES

### BRIEFS

INDIAN VICE PRESIDENT DENOUNCES ARMS RACE--New Delhi November 25 TASS--Ramaswami Venkataraman, Vice-President of India, has strongly denounced the nuclear arms race and urged removal of the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe hanging over mankind. After universal destruction in the flames of a nuclear war there will be neither winners nor losers, and the earth will be turned into a barren desert, he said speaking in the city of Santiniketan. Ramaswami Venkataraman pointed out the special danger for the cause of peace of the "star wars" plans drawn up by the U.S. Administration. The vice-president of India urged all the people of good will to pool their efforts in the struggle against the threat of a nuclear death and to make their contribution to the curbing of the arms race. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0927 GMT 25 Nov 85 LD] /6091

TASS: CANADIAN GOVERNMENT WITHHOLDS FACTS--Ottawa December 5 TASS--The conservative government conceals from the Canadian public the truth about the true scope of Canada's complicity in the U.S. nuclear-missile strategy. When preparing a list of agreements concerning military cooperation between Canada and the United States for the Foreign Affairs and National Defence Committee of the House of Commons, the Ministry of National Defence deliberately omitted eight highly important documents which concretise the nature of the two countries' cooperation in the nuclear field. Concealed from the parliamentarians, as it has become known now, were agreements which concerned, in particular, the Pentagon's right to deploy nuclear depth charges in Canadian territory, visits to Canadian ports by U.S. nuclear-powered submarines as well as a possible change in the functions of the northern warning radar line which runs across the Arctic areas of the country. The unseemly actions of the military establishment have given rise to indignation among opposition parties' deputies in the country's parliament. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 5 Dec 85 LD] /6091

UN ADOPTS NUCLEAR COOPERATION RESOLUTION--New York, December 13 TASS--The U.N. General Assembly has passed a decision on the holding of a United Nations conference on the promotion of international cooperation in peaceful uses of atomic energy from March 23 to April 10, 1987. It adopted a resolution which recorded progress achieved in the preparation of this representative international forum. The resolution points out that the results of the conference will promote free and unimpeded access, on a just and equal basis, to nuclear technology, equipment and materials which are indispensable for the advancement of national programmes for peaceful uses of atomic energy. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 13 Dec 85 LD] /6091

CSO: 5200/1198

END